# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/997,409 | 11/30/2001 | Shawn P. Delany | OBLX-01037US0 | 2499 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7590 06/03/2005 | **EXAMINER** |
| Burt Magen | NGUYEN, CINDY |
| Vierra Magen Marcus Harmon & DeNiro, LLP | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2161 | |

Suite 540
685 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-4206

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/997,409 | DELANY ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Cindy Nguyen | 2161 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/14/05*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on 11/30/2001 in which claims 1-43 are

presented for examination.

### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on May 02/18/02, 03/15/04, 03/17/04 and

03/14/05 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609.

Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has

been considered as to the merits.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 8-15 and 17-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan).

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 33, Madan discloses: A method, one or more processor

and an apparatus for modifying entries in an Identity System, comprising the steps of: creating

a first entry for said Identity System, said first entry includes a first set of attributes based on a

first set of one or more classes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and removing a

subset of said first set of attributes from said entry after said step of creating said first entry

(col. 15, lines 25-42, Madan).

In addition, Madan discloses: a communication interface (1918, fig. 19, Madan) and

one or more processors (1904, fig. 19, Madan) .

Regarding claims 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein: said first set of one

or more classes includes a structural class and a first set of one or more auxiliary

classes (col. 15, lines 35-42, Madan).

Regarding claim 17, 28 and 39, all the limitations of this claim have been noted

in the rejection of claims 1, 22, 33 above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein: said

entry is a group object (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and said step of creating includes

instantiating said group object (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claims 3, 18, 23, 29, 34 and 40, all the limitations of these claims have

been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 17, 22, 28, 33 and 39, above. In addition,

Madan discloses: wherein: said step of removing includes a step of removing one or

more auxiliary classes from said entry, said one or more auxiliary classes are

associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan).

Regarding claims 3, 19, 24, 30, 35 and 41, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3, 18, 23, 29, 34 and 40, above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein said step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said entry includes the steps of: removing a first auxiliary class associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan); and removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col. 15, lines 50 to col. 16, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3 above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein: said subset of said first set of attributes includes data stored in said attributes (col. 15, lines 40-44, Madan); and said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes removing said data (col. 15, lines 45 to col. 16, lines 2).

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3 above. In addition, Madan discloses: further comprising the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein: said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 13, lines 15-47, Madan).

Regarding claims 25 and 36, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

Regarding claims 10, 26 and 37, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 25 and 36, above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein said step of adding new attributes includes the steps of: adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and adding classes to said entry that are not already part of said entry and are superior to said one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 7 and 10 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

Regarding claims 14, 28 and 39, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33, above. In addition, Madan discloses: wherein: said entry is a group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and at least one of said new attributes stores a rule defining dynamic membership for said group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 8 above. wherein: said entry is a group entry; and

at least one of said new attributes stores a subscription policy for said group

entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claims 20, 31 and 42, all the limitations of these claims have been

noted in the rejection of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan discloses:

further comprising the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of

creating, said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary

classes associated with said

new attributes to said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claims 21, 32 and 43, all the limitations of these claims have been

noted in the rejection of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan discloses:

wherein: said group object is stored in an LDAP directory (col. 12, lines 60 to col. 13,

lines 7, Madan).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan) in view of Desgranges et al. (US 6751797) (Desgranges).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. However, Madan didn't discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface; receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface. On the other hand, Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface and receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface in the system of Madan as taught by Desgranges. The motivation being to enable the system provided a method consist of transforming the entry seen by the client into an LDAP entry through the home interface in order to crate delete and modify or search in the LDAP directory.

In addition , Madan/Desgranges discloses: removing said selected one or more of said auxiliary classes (col. 9, lines 65 to col. 10, lines 4, Madan).

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3 above.  In addition, Madan/Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of attributes in a user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of said subset of said first set of attributes via said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges);  and removing said subset of said first set of attributes from said entry (col. 14, lines 11-37, Madan).

Regarding claims 13, 27 and 38, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33 above, respectively.  wherein: said steps of creating, adding and removing are performed by an integrated identity and access system (col. 9, lines 64 to col. 10, lines 65, Desgranges);  and said an integrated identity and access system is capable of evaluating said new attributes to authorize a user to access a resource (col. 7, lines 64 to col. 8, lines 15, Desgranges).

Regarding claim 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 6 above.  It is therefore rejected as above.

### *Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025.  The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*CN*

Cindy Nguyen
May 16, 2005

FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER